

Program-Level Assessment Plan



Program: Technology and Leadership	Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master’s program, doctoral program): UG
Department: NA	College/School: School for Professional Studies
Date (Month/Year): September 2023	Primary Assessment Contact: Katie Devany & John Buerck

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods	
			Artifacts of Student Learning (What)	Evaluation Process (How)
	<p>What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program?</p> <p>Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</p>	<p>In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level at which student development is expected in each course (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.).</p>	<p>Artifacts of Student Learning (What)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What artifacts of student learning will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome? 2. In which courses will these artifacts be collected? 	<p>Evaluation Process (How)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What process will be used to evaluate the artifacts, and by whom? 2. What tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process? <p>Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.</p>
1	<p>Apply fundamental competencies from business functions.</p>	<p>CIS 2300 (I) ORLD 2000 (I) ORLD 2500 (R) ORLD 2700 (R)</p>	<p>Artifacts include a scaffolded analysis of key business functions (ORLD 2000), financial analysis case study (2500) applied organizational analysis (CIS 2300, ORLD 2700), and are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.</p>	<p>A rubric will be used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, student mastery of the related learning outcome will be assessed using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related student outcome(s) will be embedded in the artifact’s rubric to allow for assessment of the outcome(s) at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcome(s) is relevant and timely. The data from the Canvas outcomes tool will be extracted from Canvas by SPS leadership and distributed to Program Directors for review.</p>
2	<p>Analyze a problem and identify the computing requirements appropriate to its solution.</p>	<p>CIS 1600 (I) CIS 2850 (R) CIS 3300 (A)</p>	<p>Final projects are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward these outcomes.</p>	<p>A rubric will be used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, student mastery of the related learning outcome will be assessed using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related</p>

				student outcome(s) will be embedded in the artifact's rubric to allow for assessment of the outcome(s) at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcome(s) is relevant and timely. The data from the Canvas outcomes tool will be extracted from Canvas by SPS leadership and distributed to Program Directors for review.
3	Analyze the local and global impact of computing on individuals, organizations, and society.	CIS 1300 (I) CIS 3150 (R)	Final projects are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward these outcomes.	A rubric will be used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, student mastery of the related learning outcome will be assessed using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related student outcome(s) will be embedded in the artifact's rubric to allow for assessment of the outcome(s) at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcome(s) is relevant and timely. The data from the Canvas outcomes tool will be extracted from Canvas by SPS leadership and distributed to Program Directors for review.
4	Describe the role of ethics in decision-making in multicultural, professional organizations	ORLD 1000 (I) ORLD 1800 (I) ORLD 3300 (D) CIS 3150 (R) ORLD 3800 (R) ORLD 4000 (A)	Artifacts include the leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), case study analysis (ORLD 1800 and ORLD 4000), applied organizational analysis (ORLD 3300, ORLD 3800), and are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.	A rubric will be used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, student mastery of the related learning outcome will be assessed using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related student outcome(s) will be embedded in the artifact's rubric to allow for assessment of the outcome(s) at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcome(s) is relevant and timely. The data from the Canvas outcomes tool will be extracted from Canvas by SPS leadership and distributed to Program Directors for

				review.
5	Apply leadership principles in multiple contexts.	ORLD 1000 (I) ORLD 3800 (R) ORLD 4000 (A)	Artifacts include a leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), organizational design analysis (ORLD 3800), personal global leadership analysis presentation (ORLD 4000), and are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.	A rubric will be used to assess each student artifact. Additionally, student mastery of the related learning outcome will be assessed using the outcome tool in Canvas. The related student outcome(s) will be embedded in the artifact's rubric to allow for assessment of the outcome(s) at the same time as the artifact. In this way, the assessment of the student learning outcome(s) is relevant and timely. The data from the Canvas outcomes tool will be extracted from Canvas by SPS leadership and distributed to Program Directors for review.

Use of Assessment Data

1. How and when will analyzed data be used by program faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment practices?

In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. Any action items will be presented to adjunct faculty (the Program Director is the only full-time faculty member) during the fall faculty workshop for discussion and development of additional strategies or needed changes related to pedagogy, curriculum design, or assessment practice. Feedback will be summarized, and changes implemented with support from SPS leadership for the next iteration of the course where applicable or next academic year whichever comes first. Changes could include increased alignment between course and program learning outcomes, refinement of assessment and assignments between sections, or collection of data related to assessment to include greater qualitative data related to opportunities for improvement.

2. How and when will the program faculty evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?

The Program Directors will compare data from the current year to the previous year to assess the impact of changes made. Adjunct faculty will take part in this process through the gathering of their feedback and continual conversations throughout the year. This process of evaluation will commence in the late summer/early fall in time for the previously state faculty workshop.

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will program faculty assess each of the program's student learning outcomes? (Please note: It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)

Program Assessment Schedule

The following schedule provides an annual timeline for assessing the program's student learning outcomes. The assessment schedule will be reviewed annually and modified to address emerging evidence needs for assessment of a particular SLO.

	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5
AY 2023-24			CIS 1300, CIS 3150	ORLD 1000, ORLD 1800, ORLD 3300, CIS 3150, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000	
AY 2024-25	CIS 2300, ORLD 2000, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700	CIS 1600, CIS 2850, CIS 3300			ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000
AY 2025-26			CIS 1300, CIS 3150	ORLD 1000, ORLD 1800, ORLD 3300, CIS 3150, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000	

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

The Program Directors in cooperation with other full-time and adjunct faculty are involved in the development of the courses and their application to each program learning outcome within the plan. These faculties are highly invested in ensuring that course projects and other associated artifacts are created in ways that student performance toward the learning outcome can be distinguished and evidence towards achievement reported.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

ORLD 2000 Final Paper Rubric

Final Company Paper

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Readability</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Text is easy to read; the reader can understand sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace and does not have to reread any passages. The reader isn't distracted by any problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation.</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Text is easy to read in most places; reader understands sentences clearly when reading at normal pace; seldom has to reread any passages. Isolated problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract reader in a few places.</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Text is easy to read in some places; reader can understand some sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace, though may have to reread several passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader in several places.</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average The reader has consistent difficulty understanding sentences when reading at a normal pace; the reader consistently has to reread passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader repeatedly.</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation interfere with the reader's ability to understand the text's lines of reasoning.</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>

Criteria	Ratings						Pts
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome APA Style and Organization</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Correct use of APA formatting throughout 95% of document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is structured in a way that sections, and paragraphs within sections, flow easily and naturally; the organization of the paper is clear and logical; paper is clearly structured in a manner consistent with the assignment. Use of headers and subheaders in APA style. Includes an APA well-formatted Cover page.</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Uses correct APA formatting throughout 85% of the document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is generally structured logically and clearly; paper is generally structured in a manner consistent with assignment requirements; however, some paragraphs within sections may not flow smoothly or naturally, or some ideas may seem out of place in a given section. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with most of APA requirement</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Uses correct APA formatting throughout 75% of the document and reference pages. Mostly correct citation of direct and indirect quotes. There may be greater organization issues; there may be several instances of poor transition from one idea or section to another; use of headings to separate sections may not be easily identifiable; still contains all of the sections required. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in some parts of the the document. Includes a Cover page</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout parts of the document and reference pages (65% correct). Some errors in citation of direct and indirect quotes. Substantial organizational issues exist; use of headings to separate sections may be non-existent; paper may not be organized according to assignment specifications; major transition problems may be observed. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is inconsistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with little to no APA's requirements</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout the majority of the document and reference pages (less than 50% correct). Numerous errors in direct and indirect quotes. Major organizational issues exist; paper may lack several sections required by the assignment; there appears to be little flow among sections; headings typically not used. No use of headers and subheaders or used without APA formatting. Includes a Cover with no APA's formatting or no cover page.</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>	
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of SWOT analysis</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Answers all the questions of the assignment poses, most in sufficient depth for the SWOT section. Includes a</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth, for</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the SWOT analysis. Does</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>	

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
	quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components are well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis . Components meet all requirements of the checklist.	table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Components meet most of requirements of the checklist.	the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components meet at least half of the requirements of the checklist.	not include a table with the SWOT section, four-quadrants or SWOT components are missing. SWOT components meet at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist.	does not include a table or quadrants are missing. The checklist with requirements was not followed.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of Conclusion	10.0 pts Excellent Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the Conclusion section. Conclusion is well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis. Conclusion meets all requirements of the checklist.	7.5 pts Above Average Answers all the questions in sufficient depth for the conclusion section. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Conclusion meets most of requirements of the checklist.	5.01 pts Average Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth for the Conclusion section. Conclusion meets at least half of the requirements of the checklist.	2.5 pts Below Average Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the Conclusion. Conclusion meets at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist.	0.0 pts Poor Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for the Conclusion section. The checklist with requirements for the conclusion was not followed.	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Incorporation of Feedback into Final Paper	10.0 pts Excellent Paper incorporates all feedback from instructor that is provided on company assignments.	7.5 pts Above Average Paper incorporates at least about 90% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	5.01 pts Average Paper incorporates at least about 75% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	2.5 pts Below Average Paper incorporates at least about 50% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	0.0 pts Poor Paper has little to none incorporation of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome References	10.0 pts Excellent Student referenced between 12 to 14 sources with a minimum of 4 non-	7.5 pts Above Average Student referenced at least 10 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-	5.01 pts Average Student referenced at least 9 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-	2.5 pts Below Average Student referenced at least 5 sources, with a minimum of 2 non-	0.0 pts Poor Student referenced less than 3 sources or reference page is	10.0 pts

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
	5 non-website sources.	website sources.	website sources.	website sources.	missing.	
Total Points: 70.0						

ORLD 3800 Final Presentation Rubric

Presentation Content: Strategy and/or Strategic Planning Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided strategy and/or strategic planning recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Strategy and strategic planning recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide strategic and/or strategic planning recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Content: Structure & Design Elements Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided structure and design recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Structure and design recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide structure and design recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials

and/or lectures

Presentation Content: People Strategy Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided people strategy recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

People strategy recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide people strategy recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Content: Culture/ethics/values Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided culture/ethics/values recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Culture/ethics/values recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide culture/ethics/values recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Quality--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation recording was good quality in a format easy to use by the viewer; presentation was well-rehearsed and flows well; the pace and tone of the presenter were appropriate; length of presentation was 6-8 minutes

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and/or presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well;

and/or the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well; and the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

Slide Quality--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were visually attractive, creative and interesting; slides contained the appropriate amount of text using a readable font size; tables and figures were clearly visible

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and/or slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and/or tables and figures were blurry

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and tables and figures were blurry

Organization and Readability--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation slides were well-organized and free of formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and included title slide, objectives, and a reference slide

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had some formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or one of the following was missing: title, objective or reference slide

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had numerous formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or two of the following were missing: title, objective or reference slide

Support, Analysis, & Critical Thinking--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Critically analyzed and applied the course readings, lectures and interview with at least 5 direct/indirect citations

- Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and/or relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and/or made 3-4 direct/indirect citations

- Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and made 0-2 direct/indirect citations

APA Style and Citations--

Levels of Achievement:

- Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were free of APA errors; accurately used citations (direct and indirect quotes)

- Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides had some APA errors; and/or did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

- Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides had numerous APA errors; and did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

**Saint Louis University School for Professional Studies
Program Assessment Model**

The School for Professional Studies has adopted the model described in this document for programmatic assessment. Starting with new programs, the model will be phased in for all SPS programs.

The model is designed to illustrate alignment among School, program and course student learning outcomes as well as an ongoing, cyclical assessment process.



